

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-22, 24-36, 38-46, 50, and 52-57 are pending in this application.

Interview Summary

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview of March 30, 2006. Examiner Seung Lee and Allan Sponseller participated in the interview. No exhibits were shown. Applicant proposed the following amendments to claims 9 and 29:

9. (Currently amended) A smart card comprising:
a private key of a private key/public key pair;

a key household identifier, associated with one particular household, to be combined with the private key, and the combined value to be used to encrypt and decrypt media content that is associated with the one particular household and that is to be rendered at the one particular household, but not to encrypt and decrypt media content associated with other households; and

a data storage section to store data that is expected to be of value to a user.

29. (Currently amended) A method of allowing parental control over media content, the method comprising:

receiving, at a household, media content;

encrypting, at the household, all of the received media content based on a household identifier corresponding to a smart card regardless of whether the received media content was received scrambled, wherein the household identifier is associated with one household; and

requiring the smart card to be present to decrypt and render the media content.

Agreement was reached that these amendments overcome the rejections of claims 9 and 29, but no agreement as to the allowability of the claims was reached.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 9-11, 15-22, 24, 25, 29, 30, 33, 50, 52, and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,500 to Blatter et al. (hereinafter "Blatter"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9-11, 15-22, 24, 25, 29, 30, 33, 50, 52, and 53 are not anticipated by Blatter.

With respect to amended claim 9, amended claim 9 recites:

A smart card comprising:
a private key of a private key/public key pair;
a household identifier, associated with one particular household, to be combined with the private key, and the combined value to be used to encrypt and decrypt media content that is associated with the one particular household and that is to be rendered at the one particular household, but not to encrypt and decrypt media content associated with other households; and
a data storage section to store data that is expected to be of value to a user.

Applicant respectfully submits that Blatter does not disclose a private key of a private key/public key pair, and a household identifier, associated with one particular household, to be combined with the private key, and the combined value to be used to encrypt and decrypt media content that is associated with the one particular household and that is to be rendered at the one particular household as recited in amended claim 9. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 9 is allowable over Blatter.

With respect to claims 10-11 and 15, given that claims 10-11 and 15 depend from amended claim 9, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-11 and 15 are likewise allowable over Blatter for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 9.

With respect to amended claim 16, amended claim 16 recites:

A method of encrypting all media content received at a user's home from a programming source, the method comprising:

checking, at the user's home, whether a smart card is authorized to encrypt the media content; and

encrypting, at the user's home, the media content regardless of whether the received media content was received scrambled, but only if the smart card is authorized to encrypt the media content.

Applicant respectfully submits that Blatter does not disclose encrypting, at the user's home, the media content regardless of whether the received media content was received scrambled as recited in amended claim 16. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 16 is allowable over Blatter.

With respect to claims 17-20, given that claims 17-20 depend from amended claim 16, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17-20 are likewise allowable over Blatter for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 16.

With respect to amended claim 21, Applicant respectfully submits that Blatter does not disclose checking whether a portable integrated circuit device is authorized to decrypt the media content, wherein the portable integrated circuit device stores a decryption key and additional data, and wherein the decryption key is a combination of a household identifier and a private key of a private key/public key pair. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 21 is allowable over Blatter.

With respect to claims 22, 24, and 25, given that claims 22, 24, and 25 depend from amended claim 21, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 22, 24, and 25 are likewise allowable over Blatter for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 21.

With respect to amended claim 29, Applicant respectfully submits that Blatter does not disclose encrypting, at the household, all of the received media content based on a household identifier corresponding to a smart card regardless of whether the received media content was received scrambled, wherein the household identifier is associated with one household. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 29 is allowable over Blatter.

With respect to claims 30 and 33, given that claims 30 and 33 depend from amended claim 29, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 30 and 33 are likewise allowable over Blatter for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 29.

With respect to amended claim 50, Applicant respectfully submits that Blatter does not disclose encrypting, at a single house, media content based on an identifier corresponding to a plurality of smart cards regardless of whether the media content is received scrambled. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 50 is allowable over Blatter.

With respect to claims 52 and 53, given that claims 52 and 53 depend from amended claim 50, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 52 and 53 are likewise allowable over Blatter for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 50.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 13, 14, 26-28, 31, 32, 34-36, and 38-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blatter in view of U.S. Patent No.

5,666,412 to Handelman et al. (hereinafter “Handelman”). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8, 13, 14, 26-28, 31, 32, 34-36, and 38-46 are not obvious over Blatter in view of Handelman.

With respect to amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Blatter in view of Handelman does not disclose or suggest a key, associated with a household, to be used to encrypt and decrypt media content at the household that is associated with the household, the key being a combination of a household identifier and a private key of a private key/public key pair. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman.

With respect to claims 2-8, given that claims 2-8 depend from amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-8 are likewise allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1.

With respect to claims 13 and 14, claims 13 and 14 depend from amended claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13 and 14 are allowable over Blatter for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 9. Handelman is not cited as curing, and does not cure, the deficiencies of Blatter discussed above with respect to amended claim 9. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 13 and 14 are allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman.

With respect to amended claim 26, Applicant respectfully submits that Blatter in view of Handelman does not disclose or suggest an encryption module coupled to receive a multimedia presentation and encrypt, at the user's home, the

multimedia presentation based on a combination of a household identifier and a private key of a private key/public key pair maintained on one of the plurality of smart cards. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 26 is allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman.

With respect to claims 27-28, given that claims 27-28 depend from amended claim 26, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 27-28 are likewise allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 26.

With respect to claims 31 and 32, claims 31 and 32 depend from amended claim 29. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 31 and 32 are allowable over Blatter for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 29. Handelman is not cited as curing, and does not cure, the deficiencies of Blatter discussed above with respect to amended claim 29. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 31 and 32 are allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman.

With respect to amended claim 34, Applicant respectfully submits that Blatter in view of Handelman does not disclose or suggest allowing access to the media content if the rating corresponding to the media content does not exceed the rating associated with the smart card, wherein a plurality of ratings do not exceed the rating associated with the smart card, and wherein the allowing access comprises allowing the media content to be encrypted using a combination of a household identifier and a private key of a private key/public key pair, at a user's home, for subsequent processing. For at least these reasons, Applicant

respectfully submits that amended claim 34 is allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman.

With respect to claims 35-36, given that claims 35-36 depend from amended claim 34, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 35-36 are likewise allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 34.

With respect to amended claim 38, Applicant respectfully submits that Blatter in view of Handelman does not disclose or suggest controlling, at the household, encryption of the received media content based on a combination of a household identifier and a private key of a private key/public key pair corresponding to a smart card. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 38 is allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman.

With respect to claim 39, given that claim 39 depends from amended claim 38, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 39 is likewise allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 38.

With respect to amended claim 40, Applicant respectfully submits that Blatter in view of Handelman does not disclose or suggest a key, associated with one particular household, to be used to encrypt and decrypt media content associated with the one particular household at the one particular household but not to encrypt and decrypt media content associated with other households, wherein the key is to encrypt all the media content associated with the one particular household without regard for whether the media content was received

scrambled. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 40 is allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman.

With respect to claims 41-44, given that claims 41-44 depend from amended claim 40, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 41-44 are likewise allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 40.

With respect to amended claim 45, Applicant respectfully submits that Blatter in view of Handelman does not disclose or suggest maintaining, on the integrated circuit card, a key to be used to encrypt and decrypt media content associated with one particular household at the one particular household but not to encrypt and decrypt media content associated with other households, wherein the key is to be used to encrypt all the media content associated with the one particular household without regard for whether the media content was received scrambled. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 45 is allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman.

With respect to claim 46, given that claim 46 depends from amended claim 45, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 46 is likewise allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 45.

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blatter in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,411,712 to Yoshida (hereinafter “Yoshida”). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is not obvious over Blatter in view of Yoshida.

With respect to claim 12, claim 12 depends from amended claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is allowable over Blatter for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 9. Handelman is not cited as curing, and does not cure, the deficiencies of Blatter discussed above with respect to amended claim 9. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 is allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman.

Claim 54 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blatter in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,841,119 to Rouyrre et al. (hereinafter “Rouyrre”). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 54 is not obvious over Blatter in view of Rouyrre.

With respect to claim 54, claim 54 depends from amended claim 50. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 54 is allowable over Blatter for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 50. Rouyrre is not cited as curing, and does not cure, the deficiencies of Blatter discussed above with respect to amended claim 50. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 54 is allowable over Blatter in view of Rouyrre.

Claims 55-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blatter in view of Handelman and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,378,130 to Adams (hereinafter “Adams”). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 55-57 are not obvious over Blatter in view of Handelman and further in view of Adams.

With respect to claims 55-57, claims 55-57 depend from amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 55-57 are allowable over Blatter for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1. Handelman and Adams are not cited as curing, and do not cure, the deficiencies of Blatter discussed above with respect to amended claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 55-57 are allowable over Blatter in view of Handelman and further in view of Adams.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Claims 1-22, 24-36, 38-46, 50, and 52-57 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 4/24/66

By:



Allan T. Sponseller
Reg. No. 38,318
(509) 324-9256